

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5-23, 26-31, 40, 43-52 and 55-57 are currently pending in this patent application.

Claims 40, 43-52 and 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent 6,787,597 (i.e., Martin). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Martin reference appears to disclose a film-forming composition including a polymeric binder component (a) (See column 5, line 12 through column 12, line 10) and a copolymer component (c) (See column 15, line 35 through column 25, line 45). The Examiner refers to the Martin reference at column 6, lines 35-37; Applicants submit that this specific reference appears to disclose incorporating carbamate functional groups into the polymer component (a). With respect to the copolymer component (c), the Martin reference appears to disclose that the copolymer containing hydroxyethyl groups can be treated with a carbamoylating agent such as methyl carbamate (See column 25, lines 3-7). Applicants submit that this reaction would not produce a copolymer with pendant groups of the structure $-O(C)ON(R'')CH_2OR'$, as in the claimed invention. Thus, the claimed invention can be distinguished from the Martin reference and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should not stand.

Claims 1, 5-23 and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by the Martin reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Martin reference appears to disclose a film-forming composition including a copolymer component (c). See column 15, line 35 to column 25, line 45. The Martin reference discloses that a hydroxyl functional copolymer component (c) can be further reacted to form other copolymers. For example, a copolymer containing hydroxyethyl groups can be treated with a carbamoylating agent, such as methyl carbamate, to produce the corresponding carbamate functional copolymer. See column 25, lines 3-7. However, the Martin reference does not disclose any further reaction of the carbamate functional copolymer. The claimed invention includes the reaction of a carbamate functional copolymer with at least one aldehyde and at least one monohydric alcohol. Thus, the reaction product in the claimed invention can be distinguished from the disclosure in the Martin reference and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should not stand.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that based on the arguments set forth above, claims 1, 5-23, 26-31, 40, 43-52 and 55-57 are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request re-consideration and allowance of these claims.

Application No. 10/635,796
Amendment Dated August 22, 2006
In Reply to USPTO Office Action Dated May 24, 2006
PPG Docket No. 1873A1/RC

Respectfully submitted,



Carol A. Marmo
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,761

PPG Industries, Inc.
One PPG Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15272
Telephone: (412) 434-3797
Facsimile: (412) 434-4292

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
August 22, 2006